

Mr. BOEHNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I would be glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. BOEHNER. We have rules in the House about legislating on an appropriations bill, and it is clear that the intent of the author was to legislate on an appropriations bill. I think the majority did the right thing by moving the authorizing language for the minimum wage through the Rules Committee and brought it to the House floor.

So, again, the House has dealt with this. I am hopeful that the Senate will deal with it soon.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comment. I understand what the rules are, and both sides have relatively regularly waived those rules when it wanted to do something. And if we want to raise the minimum wage for our workers, we can do it. That is our perspective. But I certainly appreciate the gentleman's further education on what the rules require.

Let me ask you this. It is not on the schedule for next week. Do you anticipate any additional legislation prior to the 29th of September which would further implement the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission? As you know, there are some 19 recommendations which Governor Kean and Congressman Hamilton have observed we have not acted on. Can you tell us whether there is any anticipation of scheduling action on those issues?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. BOEHNER. Over a year ago, the House worked to implement the recommendations of the bipartisan 9/11 Commission. And I believe that Members on both sides of the Capitol, on both sides of the aisle, decided to accept those recommendations that we thought would be helpful. Not all of the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission have, in fact, been adopted because, as I understand it, Members on both sides of the aisle and on both sides of the Capitol have rejected some of the ideas that they put forth.

As we all know, some of these independent commissions get established. They can make recommendations, but the real decisions about what we should enact into law should be left to the Members, and I think the Members have made their decisions very clear.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his observations, while I think we disagree on the substance of the reports and the merits of the recommendations that have not yet been passed. I know on our side, Mr. THOMPSON, who is our ranking member on the Homeland Security Committee, and others are very hopeful that we can move forward on those. But I understand what the gentleman has said.

I will not ask the gentleman further questions. But, Mr. Speaker, under my reservation I would say that we on this side of the aisle are very hopeful that we can consider legislation before we break on the 29th of September which

would give the Secretary of Health and Human Services the authority to negotiate lower prescription drug prices for our seniors. We would hope that we would see legislation which would restore the deep cuts in college tuition assistance that were included in the deficit reduction bill that we passed some months ago and that we would reconsider the tax cuts that we gave, deep tax cuts, that we gave to oil companies apparently to spur further investment in exploration for new sources of oil. A worthy objective. But I think, happily or unhappily, depending upon your perspective, whether you are an oil company or whether you are a driver of automobiles and have to pay the gasoline prices, the companies are making great profits and could have great incentive because of those great profits to develop further sources of energy.

I would conclude by saying that we would hope the majority would seriously consider bringing to the floor all of those issues prior to the 29th.

Mr. BOEHNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to my friend, the majority leader.

Mr. BOEHNER. Just so the gentleman understands, and I appreciate his yielding, I am happy to come here and have this colloquy with you about what is going to be on the floor and give you as much information as I can.

Now, I see that my friend from Maryland today has decided to employ a new tactic in bringing campaign themes to the floor during the colloquy. Now, I would be happy to engage in those, but it is not what the colloquy is for. And so I would be happy to engage the gentleman.

The Medicare drug bill has produced premiums for seniors far below, far below, any number that anyone ever expected. And what got us those low drug premium prices was the competition that was created in the creation of the program.

Secondly, when it comes to the college loan program that the gentleman referred to that there were cuts, if the gentleman would look at the bill, he will realize that we widened the ability of more students to get to college under this program than we have ever had. The fact is there are higher numbers for grant programs, higher numbers for what you can borrow from the program, and it could not be working any better. And as a result, the Deficit Reduction Act that we passed last year did, in fact, save \$12.5 billion that came out of the hides of the lenders who were involved in the program.

So, again, I would be happy to engage you in this conversation, but we could probably do it under a Special Order rather than during the colloquy.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his observations, and perhaps I will take him up on that offer. That might be instructive for both of us and perhaps for the American people as well. I under-

stand the gentleman's perspective. We differ. That is not surprising, I am sure, to the viewers.

But I will say this, Mr. Leader, if I can, that this is about discussing the schedule. We have a very short time frame. We have 14 days left that are scheduled in this session before the election, and we are coming back for a lame duck session. I understand that. But I was simply inquiring of you whether or not those matters which we believe are important might be on the schedule. I am not debating their merits or demerits at this point in time. I can do that and, as a matter of fact, look forward to discussing that in a Special Order with you. But we do believe it was in the realm of a discussion about what might be scheduled.

And I yield to my friend.

Mr. BOEHNER. I thank my colleague. And while we may differ on whether the glass is half full or half empty, I do have great respect for my colleague from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW AND ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 2006, TO TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2006

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. tomorrow and further, that when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, September 12, 2006, for morning hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL of California). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2965, FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES COMPETITION IN CONTRACTING ACT

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules may meet the week of September 11 to grant a rule which could limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 2965, the Federal Prison Industries Competition in Contracting Act.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy of a brief explanation of the amendment to the